

CSIP Thinking Process

Non-Regulatory Guidance Document

Constant Conversation Question #4:

How will we evaluate our programs and services to ensure improved student learning?

Without Text Boxes

Westlake Community School District

- This document is the fourth of four guidance pieces about how one fictitious school district decides to “think through” a process that will lead it to a clear, concise, and usable CSIP designed to increase achievement for all students.
- This document is not intended to provide a “one size fits all” thinking process. The plan that will eventually emerge from the details that follow will be locally determined.

Guidance Document Key Points:

- The content provides a glimpse of only one district’s thinking about Question #4.
- The content demonstrates a level of detail particular to this district’s thinking.

4. How will we evaluate our programs and services to ensure improved student learning?

A. What strategies/process will we use to evaluate how well the activities included in Constant Conversation Question #2 (What do/will we do to meet student learning needs?) were implemented?

Goal-Oriented Approach to Program Evaluation

Westlake has adopted a goal-oriented approach to formally evaluate the programs and services it offers to meet prioritized student needs as identified in its CSIP. **(ECSIP1)** This goal-oriented approach to program evaluation includes the following components:

- Identification of programs that contribute to progress with CSIP goals (program expectations)
- Identification of any additional program goals (program expectations)
- Identification of variables which affect performance
- Identification of the indicators by which program effectiveness will be judged relative to performance
- Development of procedures for collecting information about performance
- Collection of performance data
- Comparison of the information regarding performance with the expected CSIP/program goals
- Communication of results of the comparison to appropriate audiences

Westlake will use a combination of formative and summative evaluation processes within the program evaluation process. **(TQ12)** The district will also determine the frequency of the formative and summative evaluation processes for each of the programs/services by two factors: 1) legal mandates and 2) local data. At a minimum, an in-depth formal summative evaluation for all of the programs that Westlake incorporates into its CSIP will occur within a five-year rotation. *Note: Westlake will submit, as required, any annual evaluation/reporting data for state and federal programs.*

The District Leadership Team recommended the following program rotation and timelines for **in-depth summative** program evaluation, using both student achievement data and teacher implementation data: *

Program	In-Depth Program Evaluation Rotation
Professional Development Program (District Career Development Plan)	Annually, beginning in 2005 (TQ10, TQ 11)*
Title II, Part A (Teacher and Principal Training/Recruiting) <i>Note: Title II, Part A is embedded into Westlake's district career development plan.</i>	Annually, beginning in 2005 (TPTR1)*
Title I, Part A (Parent Involvement)	Annually, beginning in 2005 (TITL1)*
Title II, Part D (E2T2)	Every two years, beginning in 2005 (FTP6)*
Title IV (Safe and Drug Free Schools)	Every three years, beginning in 2005 (SDF10)
Mentoring and Induction Program	Every three years, beginning in 2006 (TQ9)*
Title III (Language Instruction for LEP)	Every two years, beginning in 2006 (LEP3)*

Program	In-Depth Program Evaluation Rotation
Students)	
Talented and Gifted Program	Every five years, beginning in 2007 (GT2)
Perkins (Vocational/Career and Technical Education Programs)	Every five years, beginning in 2007 (PERK2, PERK3)*
At-risk Program	Every five years, beginning in 2008 (AR4)*
Special Education Programs and Services	Every five years, beginning in 2008 (ESPE1, ESPE2)*

Westlake will collect formative evaluation data for each program on an annual basis. However, the district will collect data regarding some programs, such as the professional development program (district career development plan), more frequently. Progress toward meeting program/service expectations will be reported to the District Leadership Team, the Board of Education, and the SIAC.

B. What implementation/student data will we collect, analyze, and use to determine how well each program/service described in Constant Conversation Question #2 (What do/will we do to meet student learning needs?) has been implemented to support our CSIP goals?

CSIP Indicator Data to Measure Program Effectiveness

Westlake will evaluate the effectiveness of the majority of its instructional programs and services, at least partially, through examination of the indicator data, *disaggregated by program participants*, for each of the goals listed in its CSIP Constant Conversation Question #2. Based on input from the program providers, Building Leadership Teams, and District Leadership Team, the district decided that evaluation of these data would be sufficient, at this time, to assist in determining the effectiveness of the following programs:

- Professional Development Program (district career development plan) **(TQ11)**
- At-Risk Program **(AR4)**
- Perkins (Vocational/Career and Technical Education Programs) **(PERK2, PERK3)**
- Mentoring and Induction Program **(TQ9)**
- Special Education Programs and Services **(ESPE2)**
- Title I, Part A (Parental Involvement Program) **(TITL1)**
- Title II, Part A (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Program) **(TPTR1)**
- Title II, Part D (E2T2) **(FTP6)**
- Title III (Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students Program) **(LEP3)**
- Title IV (Safe and Drug Free Schools) **(SDF10)**

Additional Indicator Data to Measure Program Effectiveness

The district decided that it needs additional information to determine the effectiveness of some of its programs. In addition to the indicator data associated with the CSIP goals listed in Westlake's Constant Conversation #2, the district will also collect, analyze, and use the following data to inform effectiveness with the following programs:

Professional Development Program and Title II, Part A (TQ10, TQ11, TQ12, TPTR1)

- Percentage of faculty responsible for instruction who participate in district and building career development opportunities

- Percentage of K-6 teachers who accurately use the strategies as measured by observations and implementation logs
- Percentage of K-12 teachers who document technology usage in their implementation logs
- Percentage of K-6 students who are independent at grade level on the BRI
- Percentage of 7-8 students who improve on district-developed performance tasks

Gifted and Talented Program (GT2)

Rather than judging the effectiveness of its gifted and talented program through CSIP goal indicators since Westlake does not believe that disaggregating its district-wide assessment data by gifted and talented student participants provides meaningful information, Westlake is going to use the following indicator to determine the effectiveness of its gifted and talented program:

- Percentage of all students participating in the gifted and talented program who meet goals in their individualized learning plans

Perkins (Vocational/Career and Technical Education Programs (PERK2, PERK3)

- Percentage of students by special population subgroups in career and technical programs who are proficient in occupational skills
- Percentage of graduates by special population who were program concentrators who receive a high school diploma or equivalent
- Percentage of senior program completers by subgroups who participate in career and technical programs who indicate their intention to continue their education, non-military employment, or military employment

Mentoring and Induction Program (TQ9)

- Percentage of beginning teachers participating in the mentoring and induction program who meet goals of the district career development plan, as appropriate to their teaching assignment
- Percentage of beginning teachers participating in the mentoring and induction program who demonstrate competency in classroom management skills

Special Education Programs and Services (ESPE1)

- Percentage of all students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) who meet their IEP goals

Title I, Part A, Parental Involvement (TITL1)

- Percentage of parents who participate in the annual evaluation of the parental involvement policy in improving the academic quality of schools served under Title 1, Part A

Title III (LEP3)

- Percentage of ELL students who are proficient in English